

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/542,283	Applicant(s) PETEREIT ET AL.
	Examiner ARADHANA SASAN	Art Unit 1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4, 8-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 5-7, 10 and 11 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/15/05

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 5-7 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petereit et al. (US 2003/0064036) in view of Bourns et al. (US 5,529,800).

The claimed invention is an active ingredient-containing powder with an average particle size of 200 μm or less, comprising (a) an anionic active pharmaceutical ingredient which is in the form of a solid solution and is incorporated into (b) a copolymer which consists of free-radical polymerized C₁ to C₄ esters of acrylic or methacrylic acid and further (meth)acrylate monomers which have functional tertiary amino groups, and (c) 5 to 50% by weight, based on (b), of a C₁₂ to C₂₂ carboxylic acid, (d) with the proviso that less than 3% by weight, based on the copolymer, or no emulsifier having an HLB of at least 14 is present.

Petereit teaches component (a) which is a copolymer that "consists essentially or entirely of free-radical-polymerized C₁ to C₄ esters of acrylic or methacrylic acid and further (meth)acrylate monomers which contain functional tertiary ammonium groups" (Page 1, [0014]). Petereit teaches component (b) which are emulsifiers with HLBs of at least 14, for example, sodium laurylsulphate and sodium cetylstearyl sulphate, sucrose stearate and polysorbate 80, that are present in amounts of 1-15% by weight, based on component (a) (Page 2, [0026]). The reference also discloses component (c) which is 5

to 50% by weight (based on the component (a)) of a C₁₂ to C₁₈ monocarboxylic acid for example lauric acid, myristic acid, palmitic acid and stearic acid (Page 2, [0030] and [0032]). The process of producing a pharmaceutical formulation is disclosed where "the components (a), (b) and (c) are blended with one another at ambient or elevated temperature with or without addition of water and if desired of a pharmaceutical active compound and the further customary additives and the coating and binding agent is prepared by melting, casting, spreading, spraying or granulating" (Page 3, [0049]). Processes including direct compression, extrusion and binding of powders to active-compound-containing particles are disclosed (Page 3, [0056]). "The formulation ... can be applied by granulating , ... as a melt or in aqueous suspension" (Page 4, [0073]). Active ingredients such as analgesics and antirheumatics, including ibuprofen are disclosed (Page 6, [0094] – [0095]). A dispersion of a copolymer of methyl methacrylate, butyl methacrylate and dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate in the ratio 25:25:50 with an average particle size of 15 µm (EUDRAGIT® E PO) and a copolymer of methyl methacrylate, butyl methacrylate and dimethylaminoethyl methacrylate in the ratio 25:25:50 (EUDRAGIT® E 100) are disclosed (Page 6, 0109] and [0113]). Customary additives such as release agents, pigments, stabilizers, antioxidants, pore formers, penetration promoters, lustre agents, aromatic substances or flavourings are disclosed (Page 2, [0036]).

Petereit does not expressly teach that not more than 3% by weight, based on the copolymer, of emulsifiers having an HLB of at least 14 may be present.

Bourns teaches (frosting) formulations that use emulsifier systems including aerating emulsifiers such as Polysorbate 80 (Col. 8, lines 9-19). "Since at higher levels an objectionable taste can develop, the concentration of Polysorbate 80 should be 0.01 to 0.1% of the frosting" (Col. 8, lines 20-22).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to blend together a copolymer of free-radical-polymerized C₁ to C₄ esters of acrylic or methacrylic acid and further (meth)acrylate monomers which contain functional tertiary ammonium groups, 5 to 50% by weight (based on the component (a)) of a C₁₂ to C₁₈ monocarboxylic acid, a pharmaceutical active and customary additives, as taught by Petereit, reduce the emulsifier level because of the objectionable taste, as suggested by Bourns, and produce the instant invention.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because Bourns teaches that higher levels of emulsifiers lead to objectionable taste. Therefore, one with ordinary skill in the art would reduce the level of emulsifier in the process of producing the pharmaceutical formulation.

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Regarding instant claims 5 and 10, the active ingredient-containing powder with an average particle size of 200 μm or less would have been obvious over the active-compound-containing particles taught by Petereit (Page 3, [0056]).

Regarding instant claims 6-7, the anionic analgesic or anionic antirheumatic would have been obvious over the analgesics and antirheumatics, including ibuprofen, taught by Petereit (Page 6, [0094] – [0095]).

Regarding instant claim 11, the limitation of no or only a slight bitter taste for at least 30 seconds after release would have been obvious over the polymer mixture that is particularly advantageous with simultaneously low influence on the tablet disintegration as taught by Petereit. "Even with low polymer applications of 1% by weight, a taste isolation of more than 30 sec is already achieved" (Page 4, [0071]). The limitation of adding the active ingredient powder to a pharmaceutical formulation would have been obvious over the application of the formulation in oral administration forms (Page 6, [0092]).

Conclusion

7. No claims are allowed.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aradhana Sasan whose telephone number is (571) 272-9022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday to Thursday from 6:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached at 571-272-8373. The fax phone

